

4

UNION A PLAGUE.

IN ANSWER TO
COUNSELLOR M'KENNA'S

MEMOIRE
ON THE
Projected Union.

By P. SHEEHY, Esq. A. M.

Principiis obsta, sero Medicina paratur,

Attack the Complaint in Time; the Doctor may come
too late.

Translation.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY J. HILL, 51, ABBEY-STREET.—1799.

UNION A PLAGUE,

&c.

THE People of Ireland are, in general, so averse to an Union with Great Britain, that an argumentative advocate for this measure does not appear to many in the most favourable light; other motives than conviction are supposed to influence his mind. It is not my wish to scrutinize the motives of the Author of a Memoire on the projected Union. I will allow him for my part all the advantage that accompany candour and disinterestedness. I will suppose this Memoire to be the offspring of an honourable reflecting mind, not the effusion of theatrical genius, accommodating itself to the will and directions of the manager, and it is with a degree of pleasure I make this supposition; I am warranted in so doing, by the excellence of the writer's private character, for which I esteem

him as much as I admire his abilities. It is not respectable however to display a redundancy of talents at the expence of our country's dear and invaluable rights; but it is praiseworthy to make even a feeble exertion to protect our country and its privileges. This is my best apology. The importance of the question to my country urges me to venture on the bold task of answering arguments ushered forth with all the advantages an experienced writer of celebrity must possess. I do not presume to cope with him in elegance of style, or beauty of metaphor; I am inexperienced in the art of writing, and therefore it would be folly for me to expect any literary fame by this production; I can expect no such thing; all I intend is to contribute my mite to my country's welfare, by refuting the sophistry, and detecting the fallacy of all reasoning that seems to insinuate the propriety of surrendering our independence. Indeed a plain simple style is best adapted to a subject of this nature; every individual in the nation is interested in it; their nearest and dearest interests are concerned. Were I therefore possessed of the pathos of Mr. Fox, or the rhetoric of Mr. Pitt, I should in wisdom and honesty reject both on this occasion. Where the interest is universal, the discussion should be universal, and therefore adapted to every capacity. The Author of the *Memoire* himself was fully aware of this when he wrote; his style is not so lofty and sublime as usual; policy has induced him to lower a few notes, that he may be more in unison with the public ear. The unenlightened mind, expecting that this familiarity of style which the Author condescends to adopt, is the forerunner of candour and frankness, is inveigled into an assent to many

propositions almost against his will. It is my object to prevent this calamity, by refuting Mr. M'Kenna's arguments for an Union; and I hope to prove satisfactorily, that an Union would not be useful to Ireland; and further, that the discussion of it is *inadmissible at all events*.

Let us consider but for a moment, we must clearly see the folly of two *independent* nations attempting to discuss a treaty, by which one of them surrenders her independence to the other. This should not be called a treaty, it ill deserves the name; call it rather an imposition. If ever the treaty of an Union is carried into effect, believe me both nations will not agree on the terms. The surrendering party will not yield its consent to the loss of its legislature, to the loss of its independence. Depend upon it, something besides the conviction of its utility will urge the adoption of this fatal measure. It may not be unwise to observe, that an Union has been always a favourite object with Great Britain, but a nauseous pill to Ireland, from which she turned aside when even mention was made of it. Whence this disgust, this loathing, this universal detestation of a reprobated measure? From a conviction that it is a measure that will be big with mischief and calamity to Ireland. Why Great Britain so peculiarly attached to the object of an Union? Has she from time to time immemorial looked with an impartial eye on Ireland, and unceasingly urged every or any measure that might promote the interest of Ireland? Or has she not considered every beneficial measure granted her sister as a diminution of her own capital? Look then with a jealous eye, my countrymen, on this superannuated project of an Union; it is the deformed

offspring of British ambition. This decrepid unnatural child has a claim on the British minister, and behold the time when the claim is renewed; in the Memoire it is said, " Our dissensions and our calamities have called forth the project of a new, " and it is hoped, a final arrangement in the politics of this island ;" that is, the old project is revived when we are divided and oppressed with calamity. What a fine time for discussion, for sober temperate discussion, which is recommended by the Author of Arguments FOR and AGAINST an UNION considered. When an advantage is thus taken of our distressed situation, in what light shall we view an offer of this kind? In our sober senses we would look on it with horror; we would fly from it as from an hideous monster; and now that we are intoxicated with misery and dissension, we are invited to a sober discussion of this seemingly less monstrous subject.

He must be a great prophet that can say this arrangement will be final as to our dissensions and calamities. Is it not possible that the introduction of this once hateful measure may increase our dissensions and calamities? It is not impossible but this very Union may work a contrary way, and produce a separation, a calamity to be dreaded by Great Britain as well as Ireland. We have sometimes heard of one disorder being banished by another; may not the detestation of an Union banish the rage of political and even religious animosity? Though the latter is not now, thank God, very rancorous, at least universally so, as in the days of ignorance, I am happy enough to see bigotry so weak and feeble as to be obliged sometimes to ride on the backs of politics and self-interest. She has

lost much of her poisonous vigour, and is in need of other assistance to perpetrate horrid deeds. May she grow weaker day by day, nay, hour by hour, until my fair country will have to rejoice at her death, and be no more torn by religious animosity, or rather besotted ignorance. Expecting to be pardoned this digression, I say one madness may expel another, Catholic and Protestant may lay aside their dissensions, their hellish feuds, and become Irishmen; then the minister would find that he introduced a final arrangement of politics that would not be very pleasing to him.

When I consider the improved state of the mind, can I suppose that in the eighteenth century bigotry alone has led on to murder and massacre? Not a country in Europe is now carrying on a religious war; we do not hear of any under the sun; the folly of crusades does not now exist; Turks and Christians are in alliance, and shall Christians themselves be at war for a little variance in their tenets, depending on a thousand various accidents? No. Political agitators stirred up the embers of expiring discord, and made a handle of religion; it has been made a handle of in former days, by a more cunning people than we are. Read the words of Archbishop Boulter, in his Letters on Woods's Halfpence—"But the worst of this is, that it tends to unite Protestant with Papist; and whenever that happens, good-bye to the English interest in Ireland for ever." If bigotry and religious animosity has been formerly sent us from abroad; if they have continued to be imported from our sister kingdom, I will not conceive them to be the natural growth of this country. No Let us revolve the history of a few centuries back, we

will discover the horrible motives for religious warfare to be always foreign to religion itself; nor will they be found less so, because they were often varnished with the solemn hypocrisy of the pretended ministers of God, and sometimes preached from the pulpit. It is contrary to reason and revelation that such motives can be good, can be godly; they must necessarily be wicked and ungodly. When I see the faith of Christ maintained by arms, I begin to stagger in my belief; the religion of Christ is not of this world. Reflecting on this, we might be induced to fling back in the importer's face this apple of discord, this barbarous importation, this sectarian animosity.

Yes, dear countrymen, it is not deep rooted now; if ever it did take root, it was the barrenness of the land that permitted its vegetation. We were ourselves somewhat uncivilized, but when cultivation began to creep into the mind, it spurned at the folly and wickedness of religious animosity; the now fertilized soil became too valuable to the owner not to banish such a noxious poisonous weed; and if it rears its head now and then, it must be in uncultivated soil, or it must have been transplanted from the hot-beds of artifice, crime, and luxury: it is drooping, it seems inclined to decay; no wonder; this land is not its genial bed. Put your hands to it, and you will easily extirpate this baneful root, springing from the seeds of ambitious politics and perverted religion. Be but serious, be honest, be truly religious, *do by others as you would wish them to do by you*, follow this golden rule of the Law of Nature, in which the uncivilized savage Indian, who knows nothing of Christianity, excels us Christians of every sect; this path

will guide us into the peaceful grotto of love and charity; this will heal our dissensions more effectually than an Union. After an Union, there will be an interest in keeping alive religious animosity as before. But what do I say? The present animosity is political, not religious; there are a few bigots, but they are few on all sides, who in times of commotion are ready to vent the poison they have distilled from ignorance. All parties agree, that if an Union can possibly serve Ireland, it cannot be useful 'till after a series of years; but during these very years, we will be relapsing into that ignorance from which we are now making our escape. This is very easily conceived; our seat of government will be removed; there will be no encouragement for the fine arts and sciences; there will be no encouragement for schools;

Sublatis studiorum præmiis, etiam studia peritura. TACITUS.

Destroy the rewards, and you'll destroy learning.

The poorer sort must go to business to earn taxes for British folly, British pride, and British aggrandizement; the genteeler sort must go to England, to court popularity, by being educated there. Is this the means of curing our calamities and dissensions? Will not wretched ignorance plunge us again into that abyss of bigotry we are emerging from?

This cannot be a final arrangement of the politics of this island, which will leave us in a state of ignorance increasing with time; it cannot be a wise, a good arrangement. we will flourish in trade and decline in knowledge! is this possible? if so, I will not envy that nation her trade, who

is deprived of knowledge, or the means of acquiring it.

That an Union cannot be useful to Ireland is so manifest to every disinterested Irishman, I am not astonished to discover great art in managing the metaphysical arguments in the four first pages of the Memoire; they will require attention, and must be examined carefully. This second period is very ingenious; though beautiful, I will dissect it. "It is proposed to augment the energy of the empire," yes, at the expence of Ireland, "by simplifying its constitution." Must the constitution of Ireland be destroyed to simplify the constitution of the empire? It is uncommon sophistry to simplify the whole by destroying a part, the legislature of Ireland, the most material part of the constitution of any country. This part is the essence of the constitution. To cut off a man's head to simplify his constitution, would be a surgical operation, but a mad one; to cut off the legislature, and thereby simplify the constitution of Ireland, would be a political operation, which will argue either insanity, or wretched abandoned depravity in the operator. Subtract (says the learned gentleman) a part of the constitution from the whole, another part will remain which is better, I mean more simple than the whole. If by any accident this gentleman received a purse of money from the Treasury, or elsewhere, of various denominations of coin, would he be out reasoned thus by any shrewd logician; give me the gold which is in your purse, by taking this part from the whole, the remainder will be more *simple*, or the purse will be more simplified. No; the gentleman is not a simpleton; he would not yield to such sophistry. In this manner

does a spendthrift make his purse more simple, by subtracting the best part of its contents.

Hitherto I have supposed the Empire to have but one constitution, as the gentleman himself evidently does by the words above, *its constitution*. Now I shall reason from the fact. The gentleman is mistaken in supposing the Empire to have but one constitution; the British and Irish constitutions are similar, but they are not the same, and cannot be one. The real fact then attempted to be proved is, that the energy of the British part of the Empire will be augmented, not by simplifying its constitution, but by simplifying, in other words, destroying the constitution of Ireland. This is unfair; Ireland should say it is unfounded. You do not simplify the British constitution, you multiply; you encrease the component parts of your legislature by superadding ours, and both will form a heap of heterogeneous matter; your constitution will be less simplified by having our legislature mixed with your's. And again, the energy of the Empire will be augmented more by having two legislatures, than by having but one.

Who can say that two heads are not better than one? and Scripture says, there is safety in the multitude of counsellors. I hope the British minister will have no objection to the authority of Holy Writ. The last line of the second period supposes two strange things, "that the legislature of Ireland is a cause of irritation to the people, and that peace will succeed its removal;" and to "tranquillize Ireland, by removing a great domestic cause of irritation." It would be deplorable and preposterous to find, or even to suppose the legislature of any country a *great domestic cause of irritation*,

and consequently of strife, quarrels, and massacres, its wicked accomplices. A legislature of this kind would be a monster; it would be spurious, not proceeding from the people, not representing their will, nor making laws for the peace and happiness of the people on the determination of their will. It can never be the will of a people to remain in the dreadful and alarming state of *irritation*; their common interest, which is the rule and compass of society, revolts at the idea. Talk not to me of such a self-created, self-willed animal, it would never be recognized by the people. A legislature cannot be the ax, it must from its nature be the shield and buckler of society. If either of the two latter is bad, it is because the materials of which it is made is not good; the end for which it is made is good; as an instrument of protection it is good; if it does not answer this end, it is the maker's fault. A man in former days would not be reputed a fool, who would have snatched up an instrument of protection, though he had not the time, or perhaps the wisdom to examine the stuff, and see could it answer the purpose.

The legislature is the only instrument of protection the people can have against the executive or an encroaching minister. Were they to remove this protection, at the time when the enemy of their freedom may be staring them in the face, and ready to cut them down, before they could provide themselves with a better shield for their body politic, they would be considered a nation of madmen. If any gentleman could have the effrontery to come and tell Ireland, "True it is, your legislature is your protection, your only protection against the present minister of Great Britain, or any other

“ minister, who may wish to simplify the British
 “ constitution at the expence of the Irish constitu-
 “ tion, but the stuff is not good, remove it, and
 “ as you are fretting and in dread of the enemy,
 “ it is better for you have no protection, *tranqui-*
 “ *lize* yourself by *removing this great cause of irri-*
 “ *tation*,” I would answer this gentleman in the
 name of Ireland, “ Sir, I cannot profit by your ad-
 “ vice; you would have me *remove* the only pro-
 “ tection I have, that the enemy may fall on me
 “ naked and unprotected. It seems to me, that
 “ mine enemy has dictated to you this very un-
 “ wholesome advice, and perhaps feed you for the
 “ purpose of deceiving me. No, Sir, when I am
 “ at leisure, and the enemy is at rest, I will then
 “ examine the materials, and perhaps the con-
 “ struction of this *domestic cause of irritation*, as
 “ you call it, but which I call my shield and pro-
 “ tection against the enemy; if it should happen
 “ to be *cause of irritation*, I will endeavour to
 “ make it a *cause of peace and good-will, comfort*
 “ and happiness: if I survive the contest with my
 “ powerful enemy, I will then have a lasting strong
 “ shield, a shield of brass.”

If a man happens to live in an old house, which
 seems inclined to fall, the danger of residing there-
 in does not proceed from its being an house, but
 from its being *old*. An house is an useful, a very
 useful thing, the only protection the body has a-
 gainst the inclemency of the weather; but an old
 house, from the weakness of its component parts,
 is a *cause of domestic irritation*. Is it because one
 house is old and weak, and inadequate to my pro-
 tection and that of my family, that I am to remove
 all houses out of my sight, and not venture under

the roof of a new, strong, well constructed house? Folly! Nonsense! Thus should every man determine to remove matrimony from his mind, because a scolding wife is a great cause of *domestic irritation*. Though I should allow the legislature to be a *great domestic cause of irritation*, will the removal of it to Great Britain *tranquilize* Ireland? In my soul I believe not. Why can the legislature be supposed a *great domestic cause of irritation*? The Catholics, the great bulk of the people, feel that they ought to have a share in a legislature, which is the representation of the people; and that the representation of Protestants, by much the minority, is a monopoly: this is a great cause of domestic irritation.

Some Protestants, on the other hand, think, perhaps giddily, that the representation ought to be fair; that the legislature ought to represent all the Protestants without undue influence. They are displeased with a representation of boroughs; this is another cause of irritation; and a very great cause of irritation is, that the representatives are too much in the habit of shaking hands with the minister's deputies, for what purpose they know best themselves. Will all these *causes of irritation* be *removed* by removing the legislature to Great Britain? Will not the hopes of being represented be farther removed from the Catholics? If some Protestants have to complain now of too great a familiarity between the legislator and the officers of the executive, will he not be more irritated to see him *removed* from his inspection, from all restraint, indulging himself in the embraces of the head officer of the crown.

The boroughs may be laid aside in this final ar-

rangement. Grant it. But what will it avail to
 the people to be represented by borough-mongers
 or county members, if by going to England they
 will have more inducements to desert their coun-
 try's cause? And if their efforts and struggles will
 be ineffectual, should they be honest and true to
 the most sacred trust of representation? What did
 avail the opposition of the Scotch representatives
 to the then supposed unjust tax on malt in the im-
 perial legislature after the Union? Their opposition,
 though unanimous, to other bills, also was fruitless.
 But this unanimity was not of long duration. Man,
 even as a legislator, cannot persevere in virtue,
 and resist vice eternally; they soon divided with
 the minister, perhaps to avoid the odium of the
 ministerial prints, least they may be branded with
 the disgraceful epithet of a Scotch faction. Coun-
 sellor Barnes affords a happy quotation here. "Sir
 " David Dalrymple, one of the Scotch members,
 " having by this, and one or two other ineffectual
 " struggles in defence of the particular interest of
 " his own country, learned that all such attempts
 " were vain, and that every question of that kind
 " would be decided, not by reason, but by votes,
 " called his colleagues together, and pointed out
 " the absurdity of such an opposition, but the still
 " greater one of not making the most of their situ-
 " ation."

Though the Union did not strike the gentleman
 with an assemblage of horrors when he wrote his
 Memoire, perhaps, though in the abstract, it will
 now strike him with horror. *The conditions of the*
contract shall not delay my decision; I see the mea-
 sure is in its nature *pernicious*, the *conditions* cannot
 be *salutary*; I am obliged to resist the *measure* in

limine, and its discussion is at all events inadmissible. If a robber, or any evil disposed person, shall come to my house at an unseasonable hour, and talk to me of a *treaty*, I shall resist the measure, I shall listen to no conditions; they must be pernicious; the thief shall not pass the threshold; constant experience is my monitor; I see every day such *treaties* attempted, to rob, and sometimes to murder the inhabitants. What does experience tell us of treaties of union between nations, that the weaker has invariably been robbed, plundered, and enslaved by the stronger. That an Union bears on its front strong features of mischief and injury to Ireland is certain, from the contradictory language brought forward to support it. The gentleman cannot admit a *separate legislature to be essential to Ireland*, and yet he recommends a *treaty for consolidating* the parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland. How can the parliament of Ireland be *consolidated*, if Ireland be supposed not to have a separate legislature? Perhaps by *consolidated* is meant *incorporated*; that is, mixing the two bodies into one: if so, one condition of the Union has transpired, from which we may learn the nature of this monstrous *incorporation*; one hundred out of three of the Irish legislature will be sent to the English house; in other words, a part or member of the Irish body shall be grafted on the English body. No doubt, the Irish member hanging on the English body will cut a fine figure: is this incorporation? is this mixing body with body? This inconsistency must contribute to prove, that the treaty is inadmissible at all events.

In the second page there is a good, though partial definition of the legislative function. "It is
"equally their duty to revise the conduct of those

“ persons who administer the executive authority,
 “ and to superintend the distribution of justice.”
 If the legislature is intended to control the executive, it will control more effectually the executive by residing in the country with it. You ought not remove the legislature from Ireland, because you will weaken the control over the Irish executive: in fact there will be no control but that of the minister.

The legislature, you say, is the *superintendant* of *justice*. Then you mean to say, the legislature, which is a *great cause* of *domestic irritation*, ought to be removed to Great Britain, to *superintend* the distribution of justice in Ireland. This is much in favour of the treaty, and the following is not more so: “ Here is the principle, but to what extent “ shall it be applied ? ” That the legislature is a control over the executive, and a superintendant of justice, is a good *principle*; but your conclusion from this principle is bad; you say, “ A single institution of control *may* be productive of essential “ service, and yet two, as well as twenty, may be “ excessive, inconvenient, and dangerous.” Mind the ingenuity of the Author in his *may* be productive. I say it is always *productive*, and you allowed it in your definition of the legislative function; but there is more activity than ingenuity, and more ingenuity than ingenuousness, in leaping from *two* to *twenty*. Two, three, four, five may be useful, and twenty may be excessive: is there no medium between *one* and *twenty*? But granting him the benefit of his metaphysical hypothesis, allowing two legislatures to be *inconvenient, dangerous, nay excessive*, Ireland does not demand *two*; she is not so very greedy, she is content with one; she wishes to

retain the one she has, at least till she can provide herself with a better; and every nation ought to have *one*. Every nation has an executive, and every executive should have a controlling power, in the words of the Memoire, a legislature.

Will I be allowed to make an hypothesis similar to that of the ingenious barrister? The executive powers of the nation are a *fiduciary deposit* in the hands of the Crown, to be exercised for the nation's advantage. Here is the principle, but to what extent shall it be applied? A single executive may be productive of essential service, and yet two, as well as twenty, may be excessive, inconvenient, and dangerous. Here the application is strong and well founded. By taking to herself our legislature, Great Britain will have but one legislature, and four executives, one for England, one for Scotland, one for Wales, and one for Ireland; that is, the wisdom of legislation will be to the force, and perhaps violence of the executive power, as one to four; and the legislature of Ireland will have, with its own executive, the proportion of 6 to 1.

“It is highly necessary for preserving the balance
“of our constitution, that the executive power
“should be a branch, though not the whole, of
“the legislature.” BLACKSTONE.

I have heard of proportions in mathematics, but it is the peculiar lot of the British minister to have discovered this political proportion between the executive and representative of Ireland, which I must call a *negative* proportion. Oh! very well (says the minister) you may call this a negative proportion, or what you please; by this manœuvre I gain an absolute proportion of power; for as I diminish the power of the legislative, I encrease the power of the executive, and therefore my

own. This is good calculation, and who can calculate better than the minister? Now he will give me leave to calculate further in his favour, by the same rules of addition and subtraction: take from the word *proportion* the word *absolute*, and add it to the word *power*; the answer will be, a proportion of power absolute, or absolute power, take your choice. So, if you have calculated yourself the quantity of power you are to gain, and surely you are not angry with me, for absolute power is a beautiful trinket in the eyes of every minister, and every minister's M - - - - r.

The definition of the liberties of the people, which follows in page 2, is too weak, too general, it is negative, it is not clear enough, concise enough, nor extensive enough. I need not inform the Author, what requisites establish a good definition; and as the liberties of the people can neither rise or fall by definitions, I shall have no objection to leaving the liberties of the people to themselves. It would require too much time to discuss fully this definition; and an ordinary pamphlet will not afford a full discussion of every line, which this very serious question requires. As the meeting of Parliament approaches, it will be necessary to expedite as much as possible all Pamphlets against an Union; therefore, from hurry, and want of leisure, this Pamphlet must be less correct and less compleat, than it otherwise might be.

After the too general definition of the liberties of the people, which may apply to any other community as well as ours, to a free and to a despotic government, we see introduced a few of the rights of Ireland, viz. " Trial by Jury, the common law
" and statute right of Habeas Corpus, the adminis-

"tration of civil and criminal justice, by regula-
 "tions of law, positive, notorious, and invariable."
 "ble." Admit that the regulations of law are
 with us positive, notorious, and invariable; they
 are not so with every nation on earth, and yet this
 absurdity is supposed in the next line: "The gua-
 "rantee of these rights is the first object of civil
 "society." Of what rights, let me ask? By the
 above *these rights*, must be understood the rights of
 Ireland before mentioned (though she has them in
 common with England). What has Civil Society
 in general to do with the Rights of Ireland? It is
 only a portion of civil society called Ireland, that
 is interested in her own rights; though by these
 rights of Mr. M'Kenna, is plainly understood the
 rights of any and every people on the face of the
 earth: and what are we told in this exhilarating,
 this very democratic phrase, "that the guarantee
 "of the rights of the people is the first object of
 "society." Listen to this, Irishmen, and be guid-
 ed by this safe, glorious and never-fading princi-
 ple. You are a civil society; you have rights,
 which many more powerful societies would wish to
 enjoy, but cannot; their despotic governors have
 robbed them of their rights; they deprive them of
 knowledge, by which they may know their rights;
 they deprive them of wealth, which forces a nati-
 on to feel its rights, and acquire knowledge; and
 lastly, they rob them of the blessings of friendship,
 harmony, and charity towards one another, which
 would enable them to maintain their invaluable
 rights against the vulturous ravenous claws of their
 Executives. The guarantee of your rights ought
 to be your first object as a civil society.

Will you then deliver up these your rights, your

first object, into the possession of another civil society, who perhaps has enough to do to guarantee her own rights, * without being incumbered with yours? Will any nation in her senses appoint another the trustee of her rights? Yes, in the single solitary case of necessity.

Should the English nation allow their representatives to be loaded with the double burden of the rights of the people of Ireland, and of the rights of the people of England; the people of this latter country might say to them as Horace did to his servant—" *cave ne titubes mandataque frangas,*" take care you don't fall and lose sight of your message. May the people of Ireland never have it to say to the commissioners for an Union, (if such there should be by any misfortune) take care you don't stumble into the lap of the Minister, and forget your commission.

If the people must be mad to remove to any other country the guarantee of their rights, will it argue wisdom in them to permit another power in the state, merely delegated † from them, to shift this first object of their civil society to that other country? This would be the height of madness. If ever this delegated power, the parliament of Ireland, should attempt this, they ought to have the uncontrouled unanimous consent of the people, nothing less can indemnify them. What does judge Blackstone say,

* The people of England had the pleasure of seeing the suspension of the Habeas Corpus renewed a few days ago; though ministers acknowledge the constitution is protected by 240,000 men in arms.

† Locke on Government says, the legislative cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands; for it being but a delegated power from the people, they who have it, cannot pass it over to others.

vol. 4, page 85, "No parliament can be abridged of any of its rights by any precedent one." From this premise I conclude thus fairly and naturally; therefore, any preceding one cannot destroy the rights of any succeeding parliament. This is the best argument logic can afford; it is called *a fortiori*; all reasoning is nonsense, or this argument is irresistible, and proves the incompetency of parliament to enter into the discussion without revolution, by which I mean a total and legal dissolution * of the present government. Mr. M'Kenna himself proves this by the following words: "this is the end, peers and representatives are but the means."

The guarantee of the rights of the people is the end of civil society; peers and representatives are the means employed to guarantee the rights of the people. Can any thing be plainer than this? They are the means; *means*, is a relative term, and implies an agent directing these *means* to an *end*, the means are always passive instruments in the hands of the agent; the tools of the mechanic are the means by which he gains a livelihood; this is the end, and he is the agent; the tools are passive; that is, they cannot act from themselves. The people, the nation is the agent † who employs the peers and

* Governments are dissolved from within if the legislative is altered. When any one or more shall take upon them to make laws, whom the people have not appointed so to do, they make laws without authority, which the people, therefore, are not bound to obey; by which means they come again to be out of subjection, and may constitute to themselves a new legislature as they think best, being in full liberty to resist the force of those, who, without an authority, would impose any thing on them. *Locke.*

† The people *alone* can appoint the form of the commonwealth, which is, by constituting the legislature, and appointing in whose hands that shall be. *Ibid.*

representatives as means to attain an end, namely, the guarantee of their rights. The e peers and representatives must be passive instruments in the hands of the people, except when moving towards the guarantee of their rights; this is the end of their journey, nor ought they move out of the path shewn them by the people. It is not sufficient for them to say, we are only going a little out of the common path to get at our journey's end by another road; the people must be acquainted with their movements, and prevent them from going any bye-ways, least they miss their way, and meet with some temptation to neglect their business, and thereby injure most materially and irreparably their employers*.

But again. "What reason is there to suppose that
 " the supreme tribunals of the Union may not be as
 " open to complaint, and as vigilant in redress, as
 " anxious to prevent injustice, and to avoid im-
 " posing an hardship, as our Irish parliament?" I
 have given many reasons already that answer this formidable question. I do not imagine the gentleman serious in proposing it. Surely a supreme tribunal in England, cannot be as open to complaints of the Irish, nor as vigilant in redress, as a supreme tribunal in Ireland. The nearer the tribunal the greater the advantage; nor will the former be as anxious, &c. we may judge in this case from ourselves; we are not so much affected by an

* The power of the legislature being derived from the people, by a positive voluntary act and institution, can be no other than what that act conveyed; which, being only to make laws, and not to make legislators, the legislative can have no power to transfer their authority of making laws, and place it in other hands. *Locke.*

injustice we hear spoken of, as by one we see committed ; and the hardship that is felt in our own country, affects us more than one which happens in another country, besides what is unanswerable, the English tribunals (the tribunals of the Union to be, the Irish part of the tribunals of the Union being a nonentity) have attempted to do injustice to Ireland, and impose hardships, which the Irish parliament has, to its honour be it spoken, successfully resisted *. Another reason is, a logical argument, called, *ex parte post*, that the complaints of the Irish, the evils to redress, the injustices offered, and the hardships imposed, will be so numerous after the Union, that British ears will become callous to them all, and Paddy's lamentations will be made a song of, and sung in the streets of London. Either the cause which the gentleman supports is not good, or he does not feel it strong, where he is reduced to the circuitous mode of asking questions without answering them ; giving definitions which are imperfect ; and lastly, dragging the Reader through a heap of metaphysical opinions of his own, fraught, I am bold to say, with inconsistencies.

Here comes a vague unmeaning opinion, with a long chain of fanciful declamation drawn from it : "To many it would be highly pleasing, to erect an independent government on every ten square miles of

* The commercial propositions were rejected, which if accepted, would have degraded Ireland. England did not wish to acknowledge the independence of Ireland, she did not wish to give us a free trade. The Irish parliament, backed by the patriot Volunteers, forced her to grant the latter and acknowledge the former. Moreover, the Irish parliament repealed Poyning's law, and the appeals to England in cases of law-suits ; and the English parliament did not relish this, because Ireland was greatly benefited thereby.

“ Europe.” This might be displeasing to some, but I must confess it would not chagrin me much, to see independent governments increased, because then perhaps we would see more independent people. Suppose I retort on the gentleman in his own way: “ To many it would be highly pleasing to erect a “ despotie government on every ten square miles of “ Europe.” I hope he is not one of those ; independence of mind and a love of independence are the concomitants of talents, therefore I wish not to suspect him. Does the gentleman admire the reasoning of Mr.C —, the supposed English author of *Arguments For and Against*, &c. This advocate for an Uniou, his predecessor, talks in high strains of the virtue of Washington, and sagacity of Adams ; yet they have approved of legislatures for every ten miles square, which we may call districts, and when a small district of America enjoys this benefit, will it be unwise in Ireland, to endeavour to maintain and retain a legislature for an extent of country of about 300 miles long, and 160 broad ? I would stop here, but it seems the gentleman had the American government in his eye, when he spoke of ten miles square. I must show him then he has convicted himself: “ But then how many avenues would be “ thrown open for faction ? What disunion among “ the people ! What feebleness, what distraction, in “ the public councils !” Enough of declamation. It would be endless to detail all the *whars* and *woulds* introduced here to fritter away a great question, on which depend the lives properties, and happiness of generations unborn *. Will not a small state or government have less avenues open to faction than

* These words belong to the Philanthropic Minister.

a large one ? Will not the people be more united in a small one ? And will they not have less feebleness and less distraction in their councils than large ones ? Perhaps the more a council has to do, the more people it has to make happy ; the more abuse it has to correct, the more vices it has to eradicate ; and the more virtues it is bound to instil and ingraft on the minds and hearts of the people committed to its care, the less distracted it will be. If this inconsistency can be winked at, vague declamation may decoy us. Large and small states are equally subject to the disadvantages heaped on them by their own immorality. While the infernal principles of *might* overcomes *right* influences, if not, directs the conduct of states large and small, they will all be subject to distractions within themselves, and invasions from abroad. It was to prevent invasions and attacks from one another, that the American states were urged by mutual interest not to surrender their indispensable right of legislating for themselves, tho' not more than ten square miles ; but to form a great imperial legislature called Congress, that is, a collection of deputies from each state. In this Congress each state has an equal interest and equal power, one is not superior, one is not more independent than the other ; this is a collection of independent states of ten square miles and no more ; and to prevent the evils attendant on the immorality of states as well as men in power, the equality of each state is wisely guaranteed by all the others ; this is not incorporation ; this is not subjugation ; it is federation, and a federation of the best kind. Granting now, that America, is a great and mighty incorporate state, is it free from disunions among the people, and distractions in the councils ? Granting

further, that a very small state is subject to many inconveniences; is Ireland a very small state? is she not large enough to be allowed to breath without incorporation and subjugation? is it because we have existed as a nation for upwards of 600 years, we must be tacked as a province to the skirts of another nation? This other nation cannot complain of being too small, she is large enough; she enjoys great independence; why envy us our little independence? After what I have said, I will invite the royal author of the proverbs to my assistance, chap. 30, v. 8, and say that the state large or small is the happiest, which "has neither poverty nor riches, but is fed with food convenient to her." Let this be applied to Ireland; she wishes to remain a small poor state, and England wishes to make her large and rich; yes, by incorporation. "*O! timeo Danaos et dona ferentes,*" as the unfortunate Trojans said; I dread the Greeks, and all their hellish presents.

"Let me not be considered fanciful in the position
 "I am about to lay down, that the arguments addressed to our national pride may exactly be inverted." I cannot avoid considering Mr. M'Kenna very fanciful, yet, I cannot admire his fancy. I might call it criminal, for by inverting the arguments in favour of national pride, he fancies he can subvert, that is, by turning them upside down to destroy them, as will appear from the following words: "The appearance of paradox will vanish
 "when we consider how much more real importance Ireland will derive, when by the share in
 "the general representation, which she is entitled
 "to obtain, she will be enabled to influence in
 "some respect the councils of the empire, than

“ at present, while she receives laws from the more
 “ powerful member of the confederacy.”

I have already proved, that Ireland cannot derive any real importance, and that England will only derive but an imaginary importance from an Union, in truth, an incorporation. They will have such a *share* in the general representation, as a cargo of military landsmen have in the managing and directing a transport into a safe harbour; in the hour of danger these lubberly landsmen are often an incumbrance. This is inverting the argument I will confess; for the incumbrance or hardship will proceed to Ireland, in some measure, from a want of numbers. The legislators of Ireland will nearly be to the legislators of Great Britain as one to six; considering the great crowd of passions, prejudices, and interests, which will become purely English, or at least ministerial, and clog the movements of Irish honesty and virtue, Irish influence will be to English influence as one to a hundred, nay one to a thousand; in short, it will be nothing. Look at the Scotch influence at this day. It cannot, nor will not, prevent a breach of the Union compact, by a clause of the income bill now going forward. It was agreed, that Scotch lands, should not be taxed higher than the proportion of 48,000*l.* to one million nine hundred thousand, which is 4 shillings per pound on English land; a little after the Union, it could not prevent the malt tax, the treason bill, though these are said to be infringements likewise. I cannot agree to the assertion of her receiving laws now from the more powerful member of the confederacy. England influences Ireland in making laws, but Ireland has resisted laws that were attempted to be imposed on her,

whereas after an Union she cannot, will not, resist the power, the influence, and the will of England. In Mr. Baines's very excellent historical pamphlet, the rights of the imperial crown of Ireland is to be found, this strong conclusive passage, "this circumstance (namely, the breaches of the Union compact) practically proved to the Scotch, the absurdity of having a foreign legislature to watch over their interests; and at a general meeting of the lords and commons of Scotland, it was resolved, that a bill should be brought into parliament, to dissolve the Union, &c. but in vain. The earl of Finlatter, who had received 100l. for agreeing to the Union, in the words of another, for selling his country's independence, repented too late. He stepped forward to dissolve the Union, but in vain." The Scotch part of the British legislature, were harrassed, working against the tide of English monopoly. They were tired of their labour in vain; and went with the minister*, to work for the good and advantage of the Scotch nation, to be sure. Thus we are to surrender our independence, because it is languid and ambiguous. Surely it is better than none at all. How gladly would the Scotch now accept even of languid and ambiguous independence, if their own legislators in the British senate would consent to it? And their pride then would not be *unreflecting*.

This is the end of the fanciful apology to reason; the fanciful reasoning of the gentleman, I

* Since their efforts could not serve Scotland against the English interest, he, (Sir David Dalrymple, a Scottish member) proposed they should form a squadron, to support the minister on every question, and that the *doccur* obtained for their good will, should be equally divided among them.

will not bid adieu to; I expect to meet it shortly again. "I have been led into the investigation of a subject collateral to my original undertaking". I beg your pardon, Sir. What you have said, is not merely collateral; it is the very basis of your original undertaking; it is the rock you split upon; but perhaps your frigate sails into the harbour of Union, only by a side wind; it is thus obliquely you reason. From your own confession, all the metaphysical arguments that have preceded, are mere inuendoes. Is it thus you expect to persuade us to surrender the most invaluable right of legislation? Be it collateral or fundamental, I hope I have answered your reasoning fully, and so much so, that even in this stage of your production I would freely come to the point, and have no objection to join issue with you. I flatter myself that what I have said is conclusive to an unbiassed mind, and I hope your's is so, in favour of the independence of Ireland, and that the parliament is now aware, if not before, that it ought not to enter into a treaty of Union with Great Britain, for two most cogent reasons. First, because it cannot treat without consulting the nation at large, and obtaining its unanimous, uncontrolled, uninfluenced consent. Secondly, because it has the example of the Scotch parliament (the only case at all in point) that it will repent, when it is too late.

However, I will proceed farther, and answer more briefly than I would wish the material part of the reasoning on the *national expediency* of an Union. This is the only ground the gentleman takes. I shall follow his example, and abandon the terms that may be proposed: it is my firm belief founded on mature deliberation, that the terms

cannot be good ; I mean, good enough to counter-balance the many dreadful evils that must follow the train of an Union ; they star me in the face, they are painted in large characters, nor are they less legible, because the characters may happen to be of gold, in the brazen front of an Union.

“ And expediency resolves itself into these two propositions. First, the circumstances of Europe, “ and the state of Ireland render it the essential “ interest of Ireland, to be closely connected with “ Britain ; and second, an incorporation of all the “ powers of the two states, executive and legislative, is the most permanent and eligible form of “ connection.” The truth of the first proposition cannot be denied, and it is as true in practice as in theory. Ireland is already closely combined with Great Britain, but Great Britain wishes ardently for a closer combination, that is, an Union. Great Britain is not afraid of any other country in Europe ; her naval victories, and her insular situation protects her. The state of Ireland, as we have already seen, does not warrant the dreadful remedy of an Union. The rebellion is over, and few traces of it remain, except what result immediately from such a monstrous evil, and like a cloud when dissipated, has left the atmosphere of religion clearer and brighter * ; the mind feeling a horror of atrocities committed by different sects of religion, becomes a convert to love and charity, which embraces all sects, and thus bigotry will be sure to find a grave in the pit, which was dug for humani-

• Per cades, per damna, ab ipso.

Ducit opies animumque ferro.

*Midst massacres and devastation, the sword may restore vigour and purity to religion.

ty by criminal politicians. Besides it will be the interest of England and her party, to revive animosities, even religious, on the proposal of an Union. Whence arise those wicked reports of Protestants rising against Catholics, and *vice versa*, still ringing in our ears? The second proposition of the national expediency of an Union is a *petitio principii*; it is begging the question. I say, that such an incorporation will be the reverse; it will be the least permanent, and the least eligible form of connection for Ireland. I maintain this on the authority of history, of constant and universal experience informing us that nations have never incorporated but from force. Such a state, therefore, is not eligible, and if not eligible, it cannot be permanent, except we call a connection by restraint and force permanent.

Such a connection will never be permanent, until the weaker state is reduced to a state of apathy, poverty and stupidity, by the stronger. This has ever, and ever will be the conduct of the stronger power to the weaker. Can this be called a *connection*? No, a connection is a tie of some kind, binding two states together, but in the case of *incorporation*, as is evident from the definition of the word given before, they are no longer two states, they are become one *, the weaker power merges in

• When one state is so united with another, that to one its form and seat of government remains, but that the citizens of the other, leaving their own residence, are transplanted into the seat of government, and placed under the laws of the other state it is plain that the one is entirely dissolved, but that which remains, does not cease to be the same, although by such an accession, she may have received a signal increase.

Puffendorf on the Laws of Nature and Nations.

the stronger like a glass of water in the ocean, or the same thrown into a quantity of spirits. The water loses its name, its existence, while the stronger liquor receives only nominal encrease, what it gains in quantity, it loses by the deterioration of its quality; the allusion is obvious. The power of England will not be increased much, and the power of Ireland will be destroyed. She will no longer exist as a nation; she may exist as a province, but what a miserable existence will it be? Taxed, dragooned, at the will of an haughty, imperious, profligate nation, as every powerful nation is; she must be subservient in every respect; she cannot breathe, but with the permission of her taskmaster. Talk not to me of Cork, Waterford, Galway. Upon this unerring principle, they cannot gain by incorporation. Great Britain, your mistress will not be more generous than she was as a sister; if she has been a step-sister, she will be a step-mother; if London, Liverpool, Bristol, had the monopoly of trade, they will hold it. Besides, where will your population be? Can a province pretend to the population of a nation? Exporting cities cannot flourish without population. Your population will be devoted to a military life; to support Irish incorporation. The military must be numerous; your artists will emigrate; the few that will remain, will labour hard to merit the name and claim the title of wild Irish. Thus you will advance in political life, like the crab-fish, who is said to advance by moving backwards. This is the reason perhaps, why Mr. M'Kenna has wisely observed, "On political matters, you cannot reason forward in a direct line." What a prophet of Irish calamity, flowing from incorporation! "Suppose France

“ should intrigue herself into an establishment in
 “ this country.” What is proved by this hypothesis,
 I do not know. A subjection to France would be
 a calamity, and so would a subjection to any other
 country. Are we to fly from Scylla to Carybdis?
 If any thing will rouse a nation against foreign in-
 vasion, it is a sense and love of national indepen-
 dence, and this may exist, though the representation
 be not perfectly independent, as is injuriously in-
 sinuated.

Next comes the argument drawn from the na-
 tional debt of England. We ought to partake of
 the burthen of the national debt, we are told, be-
 cause a bankruptcy would injure us; and this too
 visible injury is supported by great declamation.
 Would not this injury be much greater to Ireland,
 if she was a partner in the national debt? The
 power of Britain is *artificial*, we are told; a very
 candid declaration from her own advocate; thus it
 is with the power of every aspiring, ambitious,
 incorporating power. They support themselves by
 artifice and intrigue. Bankruptcy is a frightful
 evil, but it is secondary. The loss of independence
 is a far greater evil; all the miseries of human life
 follow the loss of freedom. It is freedom (for li-
 berty is a frightful word, though once used by Mr.
 Adams) that vivifies and gives vigour to a nation;
 it is the life and soul of a nation; but the advocate
 of *artificial Britain* assures us we shall not be asked
 to *repair a breach* in her credit; he only said so to
 feel the pulse of the nation; I hope he will find it
 beat high for independence; but his promise is gua-
 ranteed by a confession, that England has not treat-
 ed us well hitherto. This is a strong proof that
 we will be treated well after an Union. If Ireland

has been culpable to herself, it is from the intrigues and artifice of England she has been so; she is not left to herself; her councils are influenced by Great Britain. "I am no friend to posthumous resentments". No wonder, Sir, a partizan of British interest does not wish to revive the recollection of the injuries Ireland has suffered from Great Britain; but Ireland may dread more to follow, when she will be at the mercy of Great Britain; injuries may be felt without being resented, and the recollection of past conduct may be a guide to knowledge. I hope insensibility is not to be recommended to his country by the gentleman; he need not be afraid of *resentment* from Ireland, posthumous or living; she has never resented, though she may have resisted British injustice. Let them throw their own *passions* into the *shade*, before they can attempt to throw *ours*; and I am certain they will cultivate their own *interests* before *ours*; they will even venture to destroy our *interests*, in order to approach but the shadow of their own; and when they draw nearer the spectre of vanity, the English will discover, when too late, that by destroying the independence of Ireland, they have contributed to the destruction of their own, which it is their true interest to maintain.

In answer to the rest of this paragraph, I will say that the navy of England is engaged to protect our trade and our repose at present; "the finances of Britain cannot fail." Why? "Because the capital is irredeemable." What a powerful consolation for capitalists, that the debt of England is only nominal, therefore never to be paid; but if the perpetual annuities keep pace with the national debt, they will one day become nominal likewise. Let Johnny from Dover draw the conclusion

"The improvement of the steam engine," and other various discoveries are praised highly. I would have recommended first, the discovery of employments for the poor of the country, which those very machines come to rob of their bread, or dry potatoes; but a great discovery has been made by Mr. McKenna, that eternal war between nations, is beneficial in the end to one of the nations at war, because "the plunder of the continent, (he says) will be disgorged into English counting-houses." But two observations will point out the folly, if not the wickedness of this discovery. Will the English merchants be able to supply the French market? and will the French be induced to give our market the preference? The English nation is at war, and her manufacturers are in the ranks; trade is on the decline. Though we should be able to supply France, she will prefer any other market; she will be more prejudiced against us, than ever England has been against Ireland. But the *plunder of the continent* will be lavished on the war, English mouths need not gape after it; though some French plunder should slip into a counting-house, it would taint the honest earned gold of the English merchant. He should say as is said in Horace,

Odi profanum vulgus et arceo.

I hate the cursed rabble, and keep them at a distance.

"I must not dissemble that these sentiments originate in great partiality to the sister nation." I thought so myself. I conceived you to be too honest a man, too sensible a man, and too great a Milesian, to entertain sentiments so prejudicial to Ireland, if you had not a partiality for England; but

that this *partiality is founded on a sense of her virtues alone*, I will not presume to say, and on the *character and glory* of her people, &c. I am afraid she will not be as respectable after an Union as she is now. Europe will be apt to think Ireland does not deserve such compulsive, unjustifiable incorporation. The gentleman avows himself an Irish Catholic, who is not indisposed to the glory of the British empire. As another Irish Catholic, I come forward without fee or reward, and declare, that I am well disposed to the glory of the British empire; and I will be better disposed towards her, if she will condescend to share a little of her glory with Ireland, as Ireland shares with her both men and money, and every thing else she has. As a Catholic, it cannot be expected that I will attempt to justify the improvidence and indecorum of the Dublin Journal, "It is the peculiar object of government." Speaking of the loyalty of Catholics, it says, "It exactly resembles the loyalty of a chained tyger to his keeper." I disapprove totally of this language; indeed the simile is as injurious to the *keeper* as to the *tyger*. Have not the Catholics acted like sheep rather than tygers for ages? I always considered it bad policy to be in the habit of accusing a people of crimes they know nothing of; by frequent crimination they at length become familiar with the crime. If any man wishes to make a virtuous wife unfaithful, let him constantly upbraid her with infidelity.

" Though many controversies have been moved
 " on the reciprocal obligations of Great Britain
 " and Ireland, as fraternal states; in any of which,
 " if the parliament had been so constituted as to
 " have followed, its own minority, with the popu-

"lar notions of the day, there was an end to the
 "unity of the empire." As well might it be said,
 that when the parliament followed the popular no-
 tion of a free trade, there was an end to the unity
 of the empire. "Why resort to circuitous means,
 "and complex machinery for an effect, which may
 "be produced simply and directly, and by the
 "sacrifice of a very secondary object? I will an-
 swer boldly, in order to prevent despotism. By
 this *complex machinery* is meant the legislature of
 Ireland; it is also called a secondary object. Yes,
 it is so with the minister, but a primary object with
 the nation. Apply these very unconstitutional terms
 to Great Britain herself; take away the complex
 machinery of her legislature, and the effect to be
 produced, will be the mandate of the British mi-
 nister. Moreover, it is not fact that the machinery
 of the Irish legislature is complex; the minister
 finds it simple enough. This Mr. M'Kenna well
 knows, but he must urge even inconsistencies to prop
 a bad cause. Talking of the English and Irish
 legislatures, he says, "and whose views and inte-
 "rests must be intimately combined, or irrecon-
 "cileably discordant." I deny this; they may be
 discordant, though not irreconcilably; combined,
 though not intimately. We have heard of *harmoni-
 a discors*, jarring harmony. They may watch o-
 ver their own interests, about which they may dis-
 agree as they have done, and they may be alive to
 the interests of the empire, as they have been with
 unanimity. "That such mock independence af-
 "fords no reasonable occasion for vanity. I have
 "already touched on this subject." So have I;
 yet this is the point, this is the hinge, on which
 turns the whole debate. We lament that mockery

is mixed with our independence, but we are vain of it notwithstanding; we prefer a little mockery to provincial dependency. Great Britain herself, if her independence should be distorted by a little mockery, would not be advised to destroy that mocked independence, and surrender it to any state on earth. The power which mocks independence, would destroy it *, if the nation should not prevent it.

Your simile of *gaudy tatters* to a rising nation, is an affront which I can scarcely pardon. Your next concession is honest, and inclines me to pardon. "Britain has no commercial advantages to impart, but then, what are laws and opportunities, without capital?" They are every thing; they, with the industry of the people, create capital. What was the capital of England formerly, and what is it now without opportunities? We are told that the power of Great Britain is artificial; what is the capital then? Artificial, stilted by laws and opportunities. I maintain it, there is a greater proportion of real capital in Ireland, than in England, and if we have patience, it will encrease. Ireland herself has created capital since 1782, by laws, &c.

"The general introduction of manufactures must open new markets for labour, &c." We are flattered with the dinning noise of advantages to Cork, Waterford, Galway, and some say to Belfast, by an Union, and yet manufactures will flourish. Impossible; this trade being the export of pork, beef, and butter, will engage the land of

* In the independence of Great Britain herself, it is not all gold that glitters; still she is not disposed to surrender it to France, or to Mr. Adams.

two provinces, and part of a third in pasture. Will there be room for manufacturers? No, they will be in the army. Ireland will be a nation of military slaves, and cow-herds; England may have some manufacturers, but will Ireland have a great many? Experience, and the observation of what daily passes, have convinced me, that this sanguine hope is vain. Nations pretending to freedom themselves, do not deal generously with provinces. The late Chatham has said, that the provinces of absolute monarchy, enjoyed more liberty, and were more happy, than the provinces of free Britain. Will Irishmen, attend to the language of the oracle of truth, this patriot orator,

Fraught with resistless eloquence to charm,
And Britain's sons with patriot ardour warm?

Is it credible, that Cork, and other towns, will increase in wealth after an Union, in the same proportion they did from 1782, till the beginning of this war? I have often heard it said, nay, before the present war, that the export cities, Cork, Waterford, &c. always profit by a war. Ireland then must be plunged into war; eternal war, for to assuage the avarice of the Cork merchant. This is reasoning from principle. Shall the kingdom of Ireland be converted into a province? Shall it submit to dependency and abject slavery, because a few merchants of Cork, Waterford, and Galway, may gain a few pounds, or swell the file with bills of exchange? Thus might a monster wish for rebellions, because his native land is enriched with human blood. But has any of these merchants wished for war, in the criminal hopes of immoderate gain? They have missed their blow; Russian

pork and beef, which now supplies the fleet, agrees better with the minister's palate. The hungry hawk from Russia, has picked the carrion bare, and left nothing for the kite. Hear the words of the philanthropist, Fenelon, talking of a greedy commercial nation: "They would deserve to be shipwrecked, since they seek death in the midst of storms, to satisfy the avarice of merchants, and to flatter the passions of other men." Ireland will deserve to be shipwrecked if she will encounter the storms of Union to assuage the avarice of the Cork or Waterford merchant. An Union is the harbinger of political death; the loss of political liberty is always followed by the loss of wealth, credit, and industry; and above all, it robs a nation of that vigour of mind, and improvement of the understanding, which qualify man for commercial enterprise. A nation of slaves may be a nation of pedlars, but cannot be a nation of merchants. Do not imagine, that the situation of Cork, or Cove, of Waterford, or Passage, will invigorate or enrich the commerce of these cities after an Union. Both Wales and Scotland can boast of good harbours, in good situations, and yet there is not a decent house to be seen, but the house of a revenue officer, watching a forlorn coast, to prevent the smuggling of a few miserable cottagers. Near the great and spacious harbour of Milford-haven, is a little town. I have been in it, and was astonished to see a kind of a lane, not as big as the smallest in Dublin, with only two stone houses of two stories, (the rest being all cabins) near a harbour large enough for a thousand sail; and for the conviction of Irish avarice, this Milford lies in the Irish sea.

If you doubt the good effects of Liberty, and do

not dread the bad effects of thralldom, even as to commerce, listen to the sagacious Mr. Adams, talking of the people of Biscay, a mountainous, rugged, craggy country : " Some writers, (says he,) ascribe their flourishing commerce to their situation; but that cannot be ; for as this situation is no better than that of Ferrol or Corunna, that advantage is more properly due to their Liberty." In the kingdom of sluggish, enslaved, poor, miserable Spain, is a race of brave, hardy men, flourishing in commerce, because they maintained their liberty against Kings and Priests, as he says in another place.

" The people of Ireland, (says Mr. M'Kenna,) will " then have an undivided interest." Yes, they will have no interest to divide. The gentleman has my permission, " To keep in view the great number of " small banks in England and Scotland," while we keep in view the great number of large banks, and liberal discount offices, in every part of Ireland. After an Union, we might boast of the sky-rocket banks of College-green ; but would we then have to boast of a Latouche's, a Gleadowe's, a Leighton's, a Beresford's, or a Shaw's. I am now almost come to the goal. Enough for a shilling, says the Printer. But, I cannot consent to a higher charge, Mr. Printer ; writings on public subjects, should be cheap. I did intend to write a six-penny pamphlet, but I exceeded the limits of my original undertaking. However, as the Printer is not avaricious, and is a well minded man, he will not grumble at printing one or two pages more ; and I would not rest satisfied, if I did not examine " Two circumstances that dis- " posed Mr. M'Kenna, to consider favourably the " project of an Union with Great Britain ; namely, " the Commercial Propositions of 1785 ; and the

" great resemblance, which previous to the Union,
 " Scotland bore to the actual state of Ireland." The
 consideration of these ought, in my mind, to dispose
 him strongly against an Union. The only reason
 which induces Mr. M'Kenna to disapprove of the
 treaty of 1785, should induce him now to reject the
 treaty of Union at the first blush; though many
 other reasons have been discovered before now, to
 damn eternally the Commercial Propositions. This
 single reason is sufficiently strong to defeat the
 Union; here it is very a propos. " There was not
 " a jurisdiction superior to both contracting parties,
 " to enforce the rules, and decide upon the breach
 " and the performance of the agreement." No-
 thing more true than this; and it is exactly the case
 with the Union. What superior jurisdiction had
 Scotland after the Union, to enforce the rules, and
 decide upon the breach and the performance of the
 agreement in the affair of the malt tax, the treason
 bill, the peerage bill? The same that she now has in
 the case of the land tax, in the present income bill,
 (see page 28 of this pamphlet,) and the same will
 Ireland have after an Union, if, (as was the case in
 the treaty of 1785, in the words of Mr. M'Kenna,) in
 consequence of this *chasm*, (of no superior jurisdic-
 tion,) all the wise purposes of the scheme are ren-
 dered abortive. Much could be said here, but the
 reader will not require more. The next circumstance
 is, " Scotland had a popular religion, and a fa-
 " shionable one, sectarian animosities, more inve-
 " terate than Ireland." Yes, I understand England
 took advantage of these, and united Scotland.
 " The government was jealous of the people, and
 " the people of the government." Yes, the people of
 Scotland, possessing some sense, and perhaps some

share of liberty, ventured to attach a degree of responsibility to their government; they did not seem to relish abuse of power; but the government would not be teased with such idle jealousy; that the people might be less inquisitive and more submissive, the English government united Scotland. "She, too, had parliamentary factions, and coadjutors at Westminster, who fomented discontents among the most turbulent people in the world." O happy change! *O quantum distat ab, &c.* O how different is quiet Scotland from turbulent Scotland! She has now no coadjutors at Westminster; not a word is said there in her favour. What a happy change for the minister! When the English petitioned to destroy the woollen manufacture of Ireland, and the herring fishery on the coast of Wexford, the minister's scribes called any honest man of the English parliament, one of the coadjutors at Westminster, who dared, (if any such honourable, daring man then was), to protest against such pusillanimous, iniquitous conduct, saying, it would be a disgrace to Old England to rob Ireland of the gifts of nature. Yes, such an Englishman would have been said to be fomenting discontents among the turbulent people of Ireland, the most turbulent in the world, who did not respect sufficiently a minister, capable of yielding to such infamous petitions. Scotland was once awake, but she is now asleep; nor is there any fear of disturbing her in her sleep by any noise at Westminster. She is wedded, she is united to Great Britain; and ever since she accepted the offer, she has not lost a night's rest; she has slept comfortably, except in the years 1715, and 1745, when being helped to a little political opium, by some military doctors, she was once more lulled asleep, and re-

mains so to this day; turning even day into night; and thus her *days* are *days* of darkness. What glorious quiet! What happy rest! Ireland, you are a bustling stirring, active, industrious nation; go and follow the example of sluggish, sleepy Scotland; she has been lulled asleep through the means of her religious feuds. Will you keep alive your feuds, that you may meet the same fate? But two other reasons, rendered the Scotch supine and indifferent about an Union. They had very little independence to surrender; and secondly, the great ones, who generally have the disposal of nations, were needy, and accepted of 20,540*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.* as the price of Scotch independence, distributed by the Earl of Glasgow to the following persons, transcribed from Mr. Barnes's pamphlet.

	£.	s.	d.
To the Earl of Marchmont	1104	15	7
———Cromarty	300	0	0
Lord Ormistown, Lord Justice Clerk	200	0	0
Duke of Montrose	200	0	0
———Athol	1000	0	0
Earl of Balcarras	500	0	0
———Dunmore	200	0	0
Lord Anstruther	300	0	0
Mr. Stuart, of Castle-Stuart	300	0	0
Lord Elphinston	200	0	0
———Frazer	100	0	0
———Carnock, now Palwarth	50	0	0
Mr. John Campbell	200	0	0
Earl of Findlater	100	0	0
Sir Kenneth Mackenzie	100	0	0
Earl of Glencairne	100	0	0
———Kintone	200	0	0
———Forfar	100	0	0
John Muir, Provost of Aire	100	0	0
Lord Forbes	150	0	0
Earl of Seafield, Chancellor	400	0	0
Marquis of Tweedale	1000	0	0
Duke of Roxborough	500	0	0

Lord Ellibanks	-	-	-	50	0	0
— Bamf	-	-	-	11	2	0
Major Cunningham, of Echel	-	-	-	160	0	0
The Messenger that brought down the Union	-	-	-	60	0	0
Sir William Sharp	-	-	-	300	0	0
Patrick Coultrain, Provost of Wigtown	-	-	-	25	0	0
Mr. Alexander Wedderburn	-	-	-	75	0	0
The Commissioners for Equipage and daily Allowance	-	-	-	12,325	0	0
				20,540	17	7

In the above list, which Counsellor Barnes says was taken from Lockart, we see Mr. Bamf receiving the mighty sum of 11l. 2s. perhaps it was a great matter to a Scotchman a century back; the Scotch nation had lost, about that time, the sum of 400,000l. which was a great loss to that very distracted nation; but we are not in such want of money, and we have plenty of paper. To be serious, we Irishmen, are not very venal; and there was a time, when a small sum might have had a greater effect than a large one now, yet no body ever dared to offer a bribe.

About fifty years ago, when Ireland was a province, an Union was spoken of, and yet the people cried out against it, and it was given up. Will they listen to any treaty now, after having gained by great firmness and courage, a Free Trade, and the acknowledgement of the Independence of Ireland? If they do, I must submit to their will with sorrow and regret.

I have declined defending the Dublin Journal, against Mr. M'Kenna's charge of *improvidence* and great *indecorum*; I must now decline entering into any defence in favour of the Orangemen. I cannot avoid agreeing with Mr. M'Kenna, as to the bad

effects which must inevitably result from a continuance of the orange system. "The protestant mechanic, who has studied manners in an Orange lodge, and has there been taught his measure of forbearance, will be spoiled with regard to his own duties, and he will equally spoil his neighbour, a man of more feeling than reflection, whom he teases and bullies, and drives into seditious turbulence or enervated despondency. Little minds are prone enough to assume authority, where they can, and to practice an overbearing insolence of demeanour."

I shall now conclude, with a few words to Protestants and Catholics.

TO PROTESTANTS.

I should not have said that I am a Catholic, but to shew you that I am well disposed to my Protestant brethern; I am a Catholic, but no bigot; a bigot is an enemy to man, and cannot be a friend to God; *love your neighbour as yourself*, shall ever be my maxim. I never shall consider a man's religion as a bar to my friendship; and I am as little disposed to quarrel with any fellow-creature about his religion, as I am about the colour of his coat. In the words of the liberal Queen Dido: "*Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.*" The Protestant and Catholic are all the same to me in religious matters; man has to settle with his God alone; how presumptuous for another to interfere, who has his own account to settle with the Creator! It would be ludicrous to see a busy-body step in uninvited between a great lord and his taylor, to settle the taylor's bill; to attempt, uninvited, to regulate for man with his Maker, is criminal, is profane; bigotry is not the principle of any sect; it is common to all; and bigotry goes hand in hand with persecution. As a sect enjoys free-

dom, it becomes liberal ; the poor Catholic began to think better of his Protestant brother, when he felt his chains become lighter ; and I am convinced, in my soul, that were his chains knocked off, he would embrace his deliverer, let him be a Protestant, a Jew, or Heathen. My feelings and my thoughts would carry me too far on this subject for the present purpose ; but before I conclude I must tell you, there is nothing to fear from the religion of the Catholic ; the Pope is now supported by Protestant princes, and they all regret his banishment from Rome ; perhaps he receives a subsidy from the English minister at this moment. The Catholics in general have abandoned the weak doctrine of exclusive salvation. Let not Dr. Duignan, or any proctor, or even a bishop, frighten you with this hobgoblin. It was not the Catholic religion the people of Scotland professed, and they were persecuted and kept in bondage, not by Catholics but by Protestants, who sold their liberties afterwards.

TO THE CATHOLICS.

I shall not talk of past grievances ; I am not a friend to melancholy ; if a few excesses have been committed, it was the natural consequence of an unnatural rebellion ; but do not be the dupes of party in every stage of politics ; you were slandered by the party, who now perhaps find an interest in your fullen neutrality ; you are frightened with Orangemen, believe me the system was expiring when the Union was first mentioned ; it could not, it cannot last long ; government would not be mad enough to allow such an armed body in the state ; outrages cannot long survive military law ; is it this bugbear that will frighten you into a surrender of your independence ? You have been told by a gentleman,

high in office, who is supposed to have written in favour of an Union, that Protestant ascendancy, the parent of orangeship, is not approved of by many Protestants in this country. "Many Protestants in England disapprove of it, (says he), and perhaps the future ministers of Great Britain may think it unjust, that a great majority of a nation, should be deprived of the principles of freemen, on account of their religion." By this, I understand, that the honest, unbiased part of both nations, do not think a monopoly of rights can constitute real freedom; no; freedom cannot be where

———— A factious band agree,

To call it freedom, if themselves are free.

What is most frightful in the orange system is, that the lower order of Protestants thought themselves free to commit atrocities, under the protection of the orange medal; but the most just and most illustrious Cornwallis has proved to the world, that he will not connive at injustice in an orangeman, even of the highest order. Many have entered the orange lodges with honourable views of loyalty; and is it because under the mask of loyalty, some ruffians have committed outrages on innocent Catholics, that you will consent to dash away the cup of freedom for ever from your lips? Do not imitate the enraged Sampson, who pulled down the building on himself, that he might crush his enemies. You have now a glorious opportunity of shewing yourselves heroes; I mean to shew yourselves Christian heroes, in the spirit of forgiveness; for by coming forward, and supporting the Irish constitution, you will bind your Protestant brother in eternal obligations, and in peals

of gratitude he will power on you the blessings of freedom.

I may be an object of censure with some, and a subject of calumny with others; in order to avoid both, as much as possible, I will say a few words of myself. I never belonged to any political party; I was not even a member of any society in Dublin, or elsewhere; I never was even a member of any club. I attended one night, before its formation, a society for the advancement of literature; but discovered, at the onset, such bickering, such jealousy, between a few members, such caballing to become chairman, that I began to think that societies in general, and most particularly on politics, must be nurseries for pride, folly, and ambition. I never was an United Irishman, nor an Orangeman, nor could I be persuaded that either were of such magnitude, until after the rebellion broke out. Political leaders, perhaps of honest, honourable minds, should be aware of the horrors attending a revolution; and also, that combinations against the state, to redress grievances, real or imaginary, are generally discovered, and then contribute to encrease those grievances, by throwing more power into the hands of the executive. Unhappy Ireland! your executive is in the hands of the pacificator of India, else what havoc, what carnage might there have been of many of even your innocent and brave children after the defeat of the rebels. The governor was wise as he was humane; he well knew the force of an observation made by that great preacher on charity, from whose mouth words flow like honey; he lately said, at Peter's-church, "That one rebel unjustly killed, was the source of more animosity, than one thousand falling under the ax of the law." The

same divine preacher, "recommended mercy to the victorious, and not to delight in the savage luxury of blood for blood, and crime for crime."

I now conclude, with assuring every individual and party in the state, that if I have given any offence, it must be unintentionally, and that I love all my fellow-creatures indiscriminately. When talking to some, I have been considered an aristocrat; by others a democrat; because I wished to be guided impartially by reason.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Page 19, line 9, after the word *gain*, add, I have also calculated for you the quality.

Page 31, note, for *caedes* read *cædes*; and for *opies* read *opes*.